REPORT RESUMES

ED 013 352 24 AA 000 204

THE STUDENT ACTIVISTS--RIGHTS, NEEDS, AND POWERS OF UNDERGRADUATES. NEW DIMENSIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION, NUMBER 30.

BY- KATZ, JOSEPH
DUKE UNIV., DURHAM, N.C.

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-1722-30 PUB DATE APR 67
CONTRACT OEC-2-6-061722-1742
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.20 80P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STUDENT ACTIVISM, *INNOVATION, *STUDENT LEADERSHIP, *COLLEGE STUDENTS, DECISION MAKING, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION,

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ACTIVISM DEVELOPED FROM A REVIEW OF LITERATURE ATTEMPTS TO (1) PROVIDE A DEFINITION OF ACTIVISM, (2) IDENTIFY THE FORCES THAT CREATED STUDENT ACTIVISM, (3) ANALYZE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ACTIVISTS, (4) DETERMINE THE IMPLICATIONS OF ACTIVISM FOR COLLEGE POLICY, AND (5) IDENTIFY QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH. THE AUTHOR SUGGESTS A DEFINITION OF ACTIVISM IN TERMS OF THE ATTITUDES OF THE STUDENTS WHO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN THE MOVEMENT. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ACTIVISTS WERE EASILY IDENTIFIED FROM RESEARCH CONDUCTED BY SOCIOLOGISTS WHO WERE PRESENT AT BERKELEY AS THE EVENTS WERE HAPPENING. THESE STUDENTS WERE FOUND TO HAVE HIGH ACADEMIC APTITUDE, WERE GOOD ACADEMIC PERFORMERS, AND INTELLECTUALLY WERE HIGHLY MOTIVATED. THE CAUSES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MOVEMENT WERE MORE DIFFICULT TO IDENTIFY. THE AUTHOR SUGGESTS THAT THE INTELLECTUAL POVERTY IN THEIR PROSPEROUS HOMES PROVIDED MATERIAL FOR PROTEST IN ADDITION TO THE CHALLENGES PRESENTED BY THE SCHOOLS. SOME STUDENTS HAD RECEIVED TRAINING IN ORGANIZATION AND COLLECTIVE ACTION IN THE DEMONSTRATIONS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT. THEY FOUND CAUSE FOR ACTION IN STEADILY INCREASED DEMANDS FOR HIGHER ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, LACK OF MEANING IN CURRICULAR CONTENT, DISSATISFACTION WITH THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CLIMATE, DISSATISFACTION WITH THE RESTRICTIONS ON STUDENT LIVING ARRANGEMENTS, AND A NEED FOR BETTER LEGAL DEFINITION OF STUDENT RELATIONSHIP TO THE UNIVERSITY. SOME OTHER FORCES THAT APPEARED TO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO ACTIVE PROTEST WERE ALSO DISCUSSED. ONE OF THE AREAS DISCUSSED FOR FURTHER STUDY WAS THE EDUCATORS' NEED TO KNOW MORE ABOUT THE PROCESSES AND OUTCOMES OF THE ACTIVISTS' ATTEMPTS TO FIND NEW AND WORKABLE TRUTHS FOR THEIR LIVES. (AL)

BR-6-1722-30

PA 24

ED013352

NEW DIMENSIONS
in Higher Education

Number 30

THE STUDENT ACTIVISTS: RIGHTS, NEEDS AND POWERS OF UNDERGRADUATES

April, 1967

AA000204

The literature research review reported in this manuscript was made possible by Contract Number OEC 2-6-061722-1742 between Duke University, Durham, North Carolina and the United States Office of Education.

NEW DIMENSIONS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 30

THE STUDENT ACTIVISTS: RIGHTS, NEEDS AND POWERS OF UNDERGRADUATES

by Joseph Katz

Everett H. Hopkins, Editor

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

JOHN GARDNER, Secretary
Office of Education
HAROLD HOWE II, Commissioner

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Joseph Katz is Associate Director of the Institute for the Study of Human Problems at Stanford University and Research Director of the Student Development Study. In the Student Development Study, he and his associates followed the entering freshman classes at Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley through their four college years with special attention to the psychological impact of the academic and non-academic parts of their experience. The fourth year of their data collection (1964-65) turned out to be the year of the student uprising in Berkeley. Dr. Katz also has a special interest in the processes of college teaching and during recent years has engaged in several studies aiming at shortening the distance between students and teachers in the college classroom. Before assuming his present post, Dr. Katz was Research Associate in Psychiatry at Cowell Memorial Hospital of the University of California.

Dr. Katz came to psychological research from a career in philosophy, having taught at Amherst, Columbia, Cornell, and Vassar. He was Professor of Philosophy at Vassar during the period of the Vassar study of college students under the direction of Nevitt Sanford. He collaborated with Sanford on the editing of the _American College_ and contributed two chapters to that compendium of theory and research in higher education. He has served as a consultant to the Committee of the College Student of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry since 1961 and has been one of the authors of its recently published report on _Sex and the College Student_. His other publications in recent years deal with student development and the curriculum, and include _Philosophy in the West_ in collaboration with Rudolph Weingartner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

About the Author iii

Foreword v

Highlights vi

I. Causes of the Emergence of Student Activism 1

II. Comparing Today's Activism with Student Movements of the Past 16

III. A Definition of Activism 23

IV. Characteristics of the Activists 26

Socio-economic and Family Background

Academic Aptitude, Performance, and Attitudes

Personality Characteristics and Values

V. Implications for College Policy 35

VI. Questions for Further Research 47

Footnotes 52

Annotated Bibliography 58

Supplementary Bibliography 65

Reactions

FOREWORD

(If and when this manuscript is published for general distribution, the Editor will gladly prepare an appropriate Foreword for the wider audience.)

HIGHLIGHTS

1. After a period of relative quiescence and "privatism" between 1948 and 1958, a new student activism has emerged expressing itself in ideology and action in favor of social service, social and political reforms outside the university, and of curricular, social and administrative changes within it. Among other things, this activism reflects the fact that young people today have become as critical of psychological poverty as their parents were of economic poverty. Though the activists are a minority, they are representative of strivings in larger segments of the student population for more independence, more intimate communication with their peers, and more student-centered teaching.

2. Today's student activism is different from student movements in the 1930's by its emphasis on educational reforms within the university, as distinguished from political and social reforms in the society. But it resembles other movements in the American past in having students take the initiative in bringing the academic and social arrangements of the university more into line with their needs. It also shows similarities to youth movements in other countries during the 19th and 20th centuries.

3. A definition of activism is suggested which comprehends a psychological disposition toward initiative, self-expression, risk-taking, and action directed at changing the social environment.

4. Several research studies undertaken by different individuals in different parts of the country since 1964 converge toward the same picture. The student activists, as contrasted with their college peers, have parents who are higher in income, occupational status, education, political liberalism, and affectionate relations with their children. Activists are higher in academic aptitude and performance, in intellectual and aesthetic interests. They are higher in their degree of psychological autonomy, social maturity, tendencies to express feelings and impulses directly, and lack of authoritarianism.

5. Students calling for more participation in planning and decisionmaking and for more autonomy are beginning to constitute a new power in the university. Their demands have highlighted the divergent directions and life styles of the three sectors of the university: administration, faculty, and students. Student pressures have been in the direction of clearer definition of their legal status and--along with and often underneath their legal demands--of having undergraduate education serve their own psychological development more effectively.

6. By studying among other things the student activists' own attempts at fresh self-definition, their educational experiments, and ways of association, further research can increase our knowledge of the developmental needs of young people and help toward purposive changes in undergraduate education.

I. CAUSES OF THE EMERGENCE OF STUDENT ACTIVISM*

The sudden emergence of student activism came as a surprise even to those who had been studying students for a long time or had otherwise been in close contact with them. The period between 1948 and 1958 had been one of general quiescence. A last flurry of student activism occurred during the presidential campaign of 1948 when a relatively small number of college students were attracted to Henry Wallace and his third party. After 1948 it became quite common, for observers and students alike, to refer to college students as apathetic. Panels and lectures announcing a discussion of conformity could usually count on attracting a large number of students, as if students themselves felt that they were reacting to the challenges of college and of life in too passive a manner. During those years, David Riesman described this generation of students as dedicated to the ideal of "togetherness," which he said meant that the young wives of college graduates were willing to accept less high achievement in their men in return for having them at home more often with wife and children.

---

*The author is grateful to Mrs. Margaret Comstock and Dr. Susan Singer for their careful reading of the manuscript and many useful suggestions, to Dr. Singer for her assistance with the annotated bibliography, and to Mrs. Comstock for her fine editorial assistance.

Out of this same situation came the term "privatism," describing college students' expectations of finding contentment in their own personal careers and family life and a relative unconcern with larger national and international issues. Surveys such as those undertaken by Goldsen and her associates indicated that a vast number of students endorsed privatist goals much more strongly than participation in national and international affairs or community activities. Such protest as there was tended to express itself not by involvement in social action but by withdrawal into a purer private world of highly emotional and complex aesthetic sensitivity. The alienated students studied by Keniston in the late 1950's exhibit this reaction in a particularly pronounced form.

If one wants to pinpoint a date, one might set 1958 as the year of the emergence of a new activism among students, the year when SLATE (short for "Slate of Candidates") was organized at the University of California at Berkeley. It was composed of independents, political radicals, members of co-ops, and of religious groups. Somewhat prophetically, even this early group called for both social change and educational reform, issues which were to be argued for in much greater detail a few years later by student activists at Berkeley and elsewhere. The following is a statement from the Cal Reporter of March 1958:

> We will be concerned with students as citizens in society--with their involvement with national and international issues.

> We will be concerned with education--with whether or not the University helps us to be open-minded, thinking individuals.
>
> We will be concerned with academic function and civil liberties.
>
> We ask only a fair hearing in the open market place of ideas.[1]

Since 1958 there has been a great expansion of student activism. Among the events marking this expansion were the student demonstration against the House Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco in 1961; the emergence of such student activist groups as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC); student sit-ins and other demonstrations in southern and northern public places of business; student participation in voter registration; civil rights marches; and demonstrations against discrimination in hiring. A particularly dramatic moment in these student activities was reached in the Berkeley demonstration of 1964, spearheaded by the Free Speech Movement (FSM). It is of particular interest that the FSM turned its attention to the processes of education itself, asking for far-reaching changes in the administrative structure and the decision-making processes, the curriculum and the teaching methods of the university.

If one wishes to know the causes of this sudden emergence of student activism,[2] he finds that the answer is both relatively simple and relatively difficult. It is relatively simple to point to the fact that many of the leaders of the student activists received their initial training in the demonstrations and battles of the civil rights movement. These experiences enabled them to learn about organization and collective action. The movement trained them to assert themselves in the face of often overwhelming hostility. It also gave them a sense that individuals and students could make a difference in the conduct of affairs and in the reform of political institutions and laws. It supported the belief that students need not be mere absorbers of knowledge, but could also be agents in the social process. The student activists were trained by events outside of the university in the acquisition of "revolutionary" skills and attitudes that proved to be applicable to the university itself.

The more difficult question is what initially impelled students to seek out these activities, first outside and then inside the university. Here the answer is complex and as yet incomplete; but the following may be ventured. To begin with, the period after World War II brought to fruition the liberal dream that had animated the Roosevelt era during the 1930's. Economic prosperity allowed for a great expansion of the style of living and for a sense of affluence in a large segment of the middle class. (Only gradually did critics like Galbraith and Harrington point up some of the psychological hazards of affluence and the extent of poverty still existing in America. Books like theirs served as stimuli to the thinking of the activists.) The future activists, for the most part, grew up in an atmosphere of economic security, but they could not share their parents' pleasure in comparing present affluence with earlier deprivation or threat of deprivation.

At the same time, economic security facilitated their paying attention to the psychological aspect of their parents' life style, and many students came to the conclusion that their parents were too subservient to the demands of their jobs and to the social expectations of their surrounding community. Jacobs and Landau write:[3]

> In their personal life style, their aesthetic sense, many in the Movement reject affluence and its associated symbols. The ambition to escape from poverty is no spur to action in their lives, for many are children of America's post-Depression nouveau middle class. Their parents are the once-poor scholars who head rich academic institutions; the ex-union organizers who run their own large businesses; the former slum dwellers who develop segregated real-estate tracts; the families once on the WPA who live in suburbs--all those who have made it. But their parents' desire to own, to accumulate, to achieve the status and prestige which go with material wealth, are meaningless goals to the children. To them television is not a wonder but a common-place and they see the $5,000 a year their parents spend on the analyst as too high a price to pay for the loss of human values.

For this new generation the focus is no longer primarily on economic poverty--which had dominated the thinking of the Roosevelt era and was the common concern of otherwise quite distinct political parties--but on psychological poverty, an apparent characteristic of many who had become economically affluent.

While the situation in their own homes and communities provided the students with material for protest and opposition, another source of challenge was found in the school. Ever since the appearance of the first Sputnik, there has been a steady demand to raise the standards of academic performance in the pre-college schools. Conant's critique of and recommendations for the American high school was one influential expression of this trend. The resulting better preparation of students entering college, combined with the larger numbers and rates of applicants, made it possible for many undergraduate institutions to follow their natural bent and raise admission and performance standards. This emphasis on higher academic performance is frequently ascribed to competition with the Soviet Union and the increasing need for technically trained personnel. It may also be possible that a deeper social self-regulatory mechanism was at work here, stemming from a sense that human beings, if they are to remain truly alive, need to set themselves goals of performance beyond any present level of attainment. (The raising of standards thus has some kinship, in intent, with activist assertiveness.)

The raising of standards and the country's ever more complex technological and social needs created a shift in the popular conception of the scientist or the professor from that of a relatively unworldly, perhaps somewhat comic figure to the more prestigious one of a powerful agent of technological and even social, economic, and political advance. Academic and even intellectual activities came to be valued more highly. At the same time, as Katz and Sanford pointed out, the raising of standards became an obstacle to the fulfillment of the very ambitions for excellence that it aroused. It confronted the student with more rigorous and prolonged series of tests and examinations stretching from high school into college, beyond college into graduate school, and even beyond that into the life of postdoctoral fellowships or on-the-job evaluations.

Such testing is particularly difficult for the adolescent because he has to prove himself in so many other ways, especially in terms of potency as a man or woman. As Anna Freud has said:

> There is certainly one point in college life which is counter absolutely to the needs of the adolescent, and that is examinations; for examinations, which symbolically mean to the adolescent that he has to prove whether he has reached the aim of sexual maturity, give rise to enormous amounts of anxiety; and if they cannot be coped with, they then lead to disasters.[4]

Added to this persistent anxiety over performance is anxiety rising from the increasing sense that the academic tasks set for the student were not congruent with the objectives they were setting for themselves. Students, especially those inclined toward activism, strongly want to gain a firmer knowledge of what kind of people they are, what other people are like, and what makes society work or go astray. The desire to understand is closely related to the desire to do something, preferably immediately, about these matters; knowledge and action are perceived, at the penalty of "bad faith" or hypocrisy, to go together naturally. A pamphlet by Bradford Cleaveland,[5] a graduate student, expressed the frustrations over the ordinary conduct of the curriculum.

> Your (the student's) routine is comprised of a systematic psychological and spiritual brutality inflicted by a faculty of "well-meaning and nice" men who have decided that your situation is hopeless when it comes to actually participating in serious learning. As an undergraduate you receive a four-year-long series of sharp staccatos: eight semester, forty courses, one hundred twenty or more units, fifteen hundred to two thousand impersonal lectures, and over three hundred oversized "discussion" meetings. Approaching what is normally associated with learning--reading, writing, and exams--your situation becomes absurd. Over a period of four years you receive close to fifty bibliographies, ranging in length from one to eight pages, you are examined on more than one hundred occasions, and you are expected to write forty to seventy-five papers. As you well know, reading means "getting into" hundreds of books, many of which are secondary sources, in a superficial manner. You must cheat to keep up. If you don't cheat you are forced to perform without time to think in depth, and consequently you must hand in papers which are almost as shameful as the ones you've cheated on.

Besides their concern over the lack of meaning of curricular content and the lack of outlet in action for the ideas and intellectual attitudes they were acquiring in college, students also have felt that the academic and living arrangements, even in the residential colleges, did not provide enough opportunity for them to establish closer relationships with other people--peers and faculty--in study, in work, and in friendship. A leaflet, distributed in January, 1965, by the FSM,[6] expresses these sentiments.

> Although our issue has been free speech, our theme has been solidarity. When individual members of our community have acted, we joined together as a community to jointly bear the responsibility for these actions. The concept of living cannot be separated from the concept of other people. In our practical, fragemented society, too many of us have been alone. . . . And sadly there is reason to believe that even after all of the suffering which has occurred in our community, the overwhelming majority of faculty have not been permanently changed, have not joined our community, have not really listened to our voices--at this late date. For a moment, on December 8th, eight hundred and twenty-four professors gave us all a glimpse--a brief, glorious vision--of the university as a loving community.

Students are led into activism not only by negative factors, such as lack of curricular relevance or of opportunities for communication, but by positive ones as well. The activists, as will be detailed later, tend to be students who have higher academic aptitude, are better academic performers, and are intellectually more highly motivated. The frustrations of a curriculum felt to be inadequate are thus particularly great for students who care about intellectual matters in the first place. Moreover, these students have been stimulated by the university they find fault with--by the greater expression of dissensual views and more heterodox opinions that distinguish colleges and universities from the lower levels of education. Activists, in larger proportions than their classmates, report themselves to have been influenced by ideas presented in courses or by teachers and by close relations with teachers and other adults.[7]

Among other factors within the university favoring the emergence of activism must be considered the alliances, personal and political, that many graduate students have formed with undergraduates. The support of graduate students who are "older" and more experienced people, survivors of additional years of academic testing, has encouraged the undergraduate in his dissent and helped him to overcome his sense that he had no right to speak up because of his limited experience and limited number of years in the college.

In addition to the situations within the family and the school, there are broader social and political factors that have favored student activism. After the restricting phase of political fears aroused in the early 1950's by "McCarthyism," there had come a period of relaxation which affected not only the permissibility of holding dissident political views but also the conditions of holding jobs. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 in favor of desegregation had opened up the possibility of including more underprivileged people in American life. Other Supreme Court decisions dealing with censorship had considerably broadened the legal range of what was permissible free expression.

Thus the very society they were criticizing had actually moved in a direction consonant with the activists' aims; civil rights, the war on poverty, and service to others via the Peace Corps and Vista had become objectives of governmental policy. Many activists developed strong feelings that the Vietnam war was morally wrong and politically misguided. But in this too they were more or less supported by prominent academic and even political leaders and by large sections of the public.[8]

One might also raise the question as to what extent the military draft and its uncertainties contributed to the frustrations felt by activists and other students alike. The prospect of the draft powerfully influenced students' planning for the future and present. It kept people in school by constraint or moved them toward postcollege studies they might not otherwise have chosen. To a yet unresearched extent, the prospect of being drafted may have been a powerful determinant of student mood and attitudes. (Note, for example, the many demonstrations in different parts of the country protesting draft examinations or the revealing of class standing to draft boards.)

Certain social conditions favored the rise of activism, and other conditions provided the points of attack. Among the targets, as we have seen, were bureaucracy, organization, and automation--with their implied impersonality and constraint; the life style of the--often only recently--affluent members of the middle class; the slowness of progress toward civil rights and the elimination of poverty; and the war in Vietnam.

There is still another set of factors that may be adduced as accounting for the rise of activism--the direct and indirect support given to the activists by the student community at large. Direct support can be more clearly measured. Thus Jerome Byrne[9] writes in his report commissioned by a committee of the California Board of Regents:

> A reliable survey of student opinion, which we have had reviewed by independent experts, concludes that, before the December sit-in, about two-thirds of the students said they supported the FSM's objectives and about a third supported its tactics. Subsequent surveys showed that support increased after the December sit-in.

Similarly, at Stanford in the spring of 1966, 58 percent of the students voting elected as student body president a candidate who advocated, among other things, drastic changes in the curriculum and student representation on the board of trustees.[10]

What accounts for this support? The answer seems to be that the activists express in a more radical fashion aspirations shared by many other students at large. The studies of students begun at Sarah Lawrence and Bennington in the 1940's, and continued by Sanford and others in the 1950's, provide a clue. As one looks through Sanford's The American College, published in 1962, in which some 30 investigators report their researches into higher education, the themes of the student activists are clearly visible. Among these are the importance of peers and living arrangements as conditions of personal development, the role of teachers as models for the development of their students, the use and abuse of curricular content for intellectual and emotional development, and a search for more authentic moral values. Since these studies were completed, it has become more evident that students need to see their beliefs and their skills expressed in action and in their effects upon other people. (Witness the tremendous energy and enthusiasm students develop in projects where they are of help to others, such as working with slum children, the underprivileged, the delinquent, the mentally ill, and so forth.) Also in the period since 1960, students have moved away from accepting administration or faculty as in loco parentis; they have resisted social regulations as limitations on their freedom of expression, and, in the residential college, they have increasingly demanded that students be allowed to live off-campus if they so desire.

Strivings toward community, toward autonomy, and toward usefulness, in varying degrees of awareness and strength seem to be present in nearly all students. Hence, the sympathies that the activists have aroused in their fellow students seem to come out of shared aspirations and shared resistance to constraint. But it must also be said that the largest support has come to the activists primarily when issues have been defined simply and dramatically--a speaker ban, list of grades for the draft board--and often the fire has been fed by violent administrative countermeasures, such as the use of police on college campuses.[11] Large groups of students have shown themselves capable of concerted and energetic action in such dramatic periods; but they have not yet shown this same push in quieter times and in response to more complex issues.

We have listed four principal sets of factors which may be considered to have contributed to the rise of student activism: (1) family, (2) school, (3) the social and political climate, and (4) the developmental needs of adolescents. This is quite similar to a scheme proposed by Sampson of "activism-inducing contexts." He lists (1) family, (2) personality, (3) institution, (4) the national and international arena. Sampson is particularly explicit on the activism-inducing factors within the institution. He discusses 12 such influences: (1) the presence of like-minded peers, (2) the participation of graduate students, (3) the history of an institution's mode of conflict resolution, (4) the "rationalization" (vs. the humanization) of education, (5) the degree to which the university is a "knowledge factory," (6) the actions and attitudes of the administration and (7) of the faculty, (8) the brief duration of any student's presence in school (whence the pressure for immediate change), (9) the parainstitutional environment: ex-students and non-students, (10) the opinions and attitudes of the public, (11) of the mass media, and (12) the degree of students' participation in decision-making. Accounts such as Sampson's underline the complexity of the situation and should help us in the future to predict better and act more purposively. It might be added that the felt complexity of the situation has often been used as a reason for inaction. But as the student uprisings have also shown, lack of change may be a function not only of complexity, but of a stagnant balance of powers. We will return to this point.

II. COMPARING TODAY'S ACTIVISM WITH STUDENT MOVEMENTS OF THE PAST

Many commentators on the current student movement have raised questions about its uniqueness and about its similarities or divergences from other youth movements of the past. When one compares the current activists with the students who were active in the period before World War II, particularly during the 1930's, the difference is not only that student activism was then centered on economic socialism but also that it was strongly tied to existing political parties. Given the antiorganizational ideology of the current student activists and their sometimes almost "anarchistic" emphasis on individuality, they do not find themselves strongly identified with existing parties. When interviewed, they would say that they could participate in the student movement only because their membership was temporary and the organizational control over them very loose. Their ideological inspirations come from a wide variety of literary, political, sociological, and psychological writers--Camus, Fromm, Sorel, Nietzsche, Goodman, Hesse, and Lenin may all be mentioned in the same breath--something that would have struck the doctrinally tidy activists of the 1930's as a mixing of opposites. Membership in the movement spans all political parties. Thus, a survey of demonstrators conducted by Glen

Lyonns[12] showed them constituted of 13 percent conservative Republicans and Democrats, 10 percent liberal Republicans, 48 percent liberal Democrats, 17 percent democratic socialists and only 3 percent revolutionary socialists. Only on the fringe, where the "Old Left" such as the Progressive Labor Movement resides, are the economic, class warfare, and party-oriented slogans of the 1920's and 1930's still heard.

Moreover, the pre-World War II activists ran into problems with their university only secondarily over their rights to express or hear others express their dissident views within the confines of the university. The present student movement has made the political, organizational, and curricular structures of the university a primary target of criticism. Thus Bradford Cleaveland in his Letter to Undergraduates[13] ends with eight demands. All eight focus on the internal affairs of the university. The first six of these demands are:

> 1. Immediate commitment of the university to the total elimination of the course/grade/unit system of undergraduate learning in the social sciences and humanities.
>
> 2. Immediate disbanding of all university dorms and living group rules which prescribe hours and which provide for a system of student-imposed discipline, thereby dividing students against themselves.
>
> 3. Immediate negotiations on the establishment of a permanent student voice which is effective (that is, independent) in running university affairs.
>
> 4. Immediate efforts to begin recruitment of an undergraduate teaching faculty to handle undergraduate learning

> in social sciences and humanities.
>
> 5. Immediate negotiations regarding two methods of undergraduate learning which provide for the basic freedom required in learning: (a) a terminal examination system which will be voluntary and an option with "b;" (b) immediate creation of undergraduate programs of a wide variety in which the student will be given careful, but minimal guidance, without courses, grades and units.
>
> 6. Immediate establishment of a university committee to deal with these demands on the Berkeley campus.

Though much in the current student movement thus is different or even unique, one can connect it with the past in at least two ways--with several major efforts at reform by students in the American past, and with youth movements of the past in other countries.

Several times in American history educational innovations have been due either to the initiative of students or to pressures from them. Such an innovation was the introduction of the extracurriculum in the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Students formed their own literary sociaties whose libraries often outstripped the college libraries in number of volumes and range of subjects. Frederick Rudolph writes:

> In a sense, the literary societies and their libraries, the clubs, journals and organizations which compensated for the neglect of science, English literature, history, music, and art in the curriculum--this vast developing extracurriculum was the student response to the classical course of study. It brought prestige to the life of the mind. It helped to liberate the intellect on the American campus.[14]

Similarly, at about the same time, the fraternities were founded to fill, in Rudolph's words, not a curricular vacuum, but an emotional and social one. The fraternities filled a need not dissimilar to the need felt by present activists for community, comradeship, and a chance for personal growth in a setting less austere than the academic sector of the college. (Even in the early days fraternities were accused, as by Mark Hopkins, of making these benefits available by creating "class and faction.") The introduction of organized athletics, partially under the stimulus of the Turnvereine of the midcentury German immigrants, served to expand further the range of behavior and cultivation of qualities open to the American college student.

Another antecedent--this time the interplay between the climate of opinion in the society and innovations sought by undergraduates--can be seen in the impact of the Progressive movement of Theodore Roosevelt, La Follette, and others on undergraduate life. The Progressive movement, according to Rudolph,[15] led to expanded student government, the honor system, and senior honorary societies.

> This movement toward greater formal recognition of student responsibility was probably a response to the sudden massive growth of athletics, the tendency of many institutions to assume a posture of treating their students as if they were grown up, and a disinclination on the part of the new professors with their Ph.D. degrees and scholarly orientation to have anything to do with such trivial matters as discipline and the extracurriculum.

Allowing the students to exercise the responsibility they seek and restricting the in loco parentis function thus also has its precursors.

The student movement of the 1960's also exhibits some of the generic characteristics of youth movements. The historian Hans Kohn[16] defines the central characteristics of a youth movement in the following way: "Basic to all youth movements are a deep dissatisfaction with the existing intellectual, moral, social or political order, a desire to change this order, and a confidence in the power of youth to accomplish this change."

Kohn traces the history of several European youth movements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. They had different characteristics in different countries and at different times. Italy's Young Europe movement in the 1840's had more nationalistic aspirations. Russia's "nihilists" of the 1860's resemble somewhat the alienated American students that in our day have been described by Keniston. Germany's youth movement before World War I, composed of the sons and daughters of the relatively well-to-do, was inspired by philosophy and poetry, argued for more liberty, sincerity, and beauty as opposed to the materialism, conventionalisms, and bureaucracy of the Wilhelmine era. There was a longing for community and a cultivation of folk songs, folk dance, and folklore. Wandering, hiking, and camping were favorite activities of these youth. There was no clear program or aim either politically or socially. (In opposing the established bureaucracy the desire for real leadership was expressed--a development that in the 1920's took an ominous turn.) After World War I the German youth movements "began to lose their character as movements of individualistic revolt. They became indoctrinated with definite political and social theories and were transformed from independent expressions of autonomous youth into tools of state, party or church."

This look at the past shows that there are recurrent themes in youth movements.[17] Among them is the opposition to the impersonal organization of human life; opposition to the sacrifice of moral, emotional, intellectual, and aesthetic values to material expansion; and a desire for greater closeness with other people. But as the experience of American student efforts in the last century indicates, educational institutions in this country have shown sufficient flexibility to accommodate themselves to the needs of students. The German youth movement made no similar impact on its educational system--and here perhaps is one reason for its eventual replacement by the totalitarian youth organizations. The question today is to what extent the present American colleges--caught in a phase of unprecedented material expansion--will respond to the needs and aspirations of their students.

Tracing similarities between the present student activists and other youth movements may be taken as support of the often-heard argument that the student movement is a form of generational rebellion. It is then seen as perhaps a temporarily necessary rejection of parental values on the student's way toward arriving at his own--which, it is presumed, will be rather much like the parental ones. But to view matters in this way may serve to "explain away" some of the legitimate, even if not fully articulate, criticisms by students of existing educational and other social arrangements. Perhaps, instead of treating youthful idealism as a "phase," we should move to utilize the adolescent's blunt and often honest perceptions as a source of social self-renewal and help him to translate his idealism into reality, instead of encouraging him to repudiate it as soon as possible.[18]

The problem of the institutionalization of social criticism and social reform is a complex one. In 1965 there were some indications that the student movement might take the initiative itself by assuming more organized form, in analogy to the labor movement, and might base itself on more fully articulated educational theory and educational plans. But though student activism has manifested itself frequently in the two years since, no permanent organizational or ideological structures have emerged.

III. A DEFINITION OF ACTIVISM

Before setting out to give a description of the characteristics of the activists, one should consider what sort of people are denoted by the term. In a narrow sense one could denote as "activist" only those students who participate in activities and demonstrations where their own personal risk is high, such as a sit-in in which there is a good possibility of arrests. One might even want to make a distinction between demonstrations in and outside the university. For a wider definition one might wish to include all those who give a substantial amount of their time to reforms in (or outside) the university. For a still wider definition one could include all students who are ideologically in sympathy with the objectives of the activists and may occasionally participate in their activities.

There are no simple organizational criteria for determining who is an activist. The various campus movements are loosely organized and do not have regular dues-paying memberships. The actual membership in more organized student activist organizations is small, but the number of members does not necessarily reflect the kind of following and sympathies they have on their respective campuses.[19]

Another definitional question is whether one is to include under "activism" those who protest indirectly against existing arrangements. If one does so, then the definition might comprehend the "alienated" student whose protest is of a passive and withdrawing sort, and the "hippies" who tend to seek their salvation primarily in the cultivation of their own artistic, literary, and ideological values.[20] What makes the question more difficult is that these groups at times can be swept into more active protest. Thus, at the end of the 1966 crisis in Berkeley, Mario Savio called for an alliance of students and hippies.[21]

We may venture a definition of our own, depicting an activist syndrome which would allow one to classify people according to the degree to which they share in it. Our definition has four parts: (1) Activeness in the psychological sense, as opposed to passivity--an orientation characterized by initiative and attempt at mastery of frustrating conditions, instead of submission, conformity, and inhibitory self-blame. (2) A social or environmental perspective that locates conditions of personal or group malfunctioning in institutional structures, and, instead of accepting these as given, attempts to change them. Part of this perspective is a high valuation of (a) association with and (b) doing things for other people. The call for participatory democracy and the seeking out of helping and social service activities by the activists are characteristic instances of this perspective.[22] (3) A tendency toward the exploration of one's inner life[23] and the assertion of impulses that are felt to be helpful to the freeing of one's potentialities and the overcoming of restrictions that inhibit the range and pleasure of experience. This tendency can be expressed by the assertion of a purified morality, by claiming and practicing greater freedom of impulse expression than is common in the rest of society, and by prolonged and arduous self-confrontation as a step toward effecting more profound changes in oneself. (4) The willingness to risk some future social or economic opportunities or to take personal risks, both in regard to physical or psychological safety, in the service of an eventual higher integration.

The definition just given is obviously both exploratory and ideal-typic. It does not describe specific people, but rather a syndrome in which people may share in varying ways. But such a definition may direct us away from a more superficial understanding of activism toward a greater awareness of the profound psychological forces at work.

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ACTIVISTS

The complexity of the nature of activism is also revealed when we turn to the available research. In contrast to many other aspects of student behavior, activism has received a fair amount of research attention and--what is relatively rare--many of these studies were undertaken at the times of crisis when sufficient numbers of students were available and when their reactions were fresh. The group most often studied has been the Berkeley FSM, particularly those members arrested during the Sproul Hall sit-in of December, 1964. FSM students have been studied by Block, Haan, and Smith; Heist; Katz; Lyonns; Somers; and Watts and Whittaker. Student activists and demonstrators at Chicago have been studied by Flacks, and at Pennsylvania State by Westby and Braungart. These studies were done independent of each other by investigators from different social science disciplines, with different instruments, and different research styles. The amazing fact is that the results of all these studies converge, that they do not contradict each other in the major findings. In what follows we sum up the findings under the three headings of (1) socioeconomic and family background, (2) academic aptitude, performance, and attitudes, and (3) personality characteristics and values. Most of the findings reported here have been arrived at by several investigators; and with the one exception noted, the findings are not inconsistent with each other.

Socioeconomic and Family Background

The activists' parents are higher in income, occupational status, and education than the parents of nonactivists. They tend to be politically more liberal. Their child-rearing practices were more permissive and the parents had closer affective relationships with their children than parents of nonactivists. At the same time, disagreement was more openly expressed in activist than nonactivist homes. Jewish students are overrepresented and Catholic students tend to be underrepresented in activist samples.

These findings put into question the "conflict between generations" thesis that has been advanced as one explanation of the activist protest. Many activists seem to be acting in conformity with their parents' values, but they want to express these values in a purer, less compromising, and more energetic way than they think their parents do. Moreover, they seem to be using the freedom of dissent and the affection they have experienced at home as a yardstick by which to measure the behavior and attitudes of the authorities at school and in the society at large.

The overrepresentation of Jewish students may be ascribed--among other factors--to the often high degree of intellectual motivation among Jewish students, which, as we shall see, is a distinguishing characteristic of the activists, too (many Ivy League colleges also have an overrepresentation of Jewish students). It may also be ascribed to Jewish students' experience of minority status and discrimination, which may have made them more sensitive to social injustice, and (given the high morale among American Jews) more prone to work actively for the eventual eradication of such discrimination.

Academic Aptitude, Performance, and Attitudes

Activists scored significantly higher than nonactivists in verbal aptitude, but not in mathematical aptitude. Their grade-point averages are also significantly higher.[24] They score higher on scales measuring theoretical orientation, liking for reflective thought, diversity of interests, and aestheticism. In line with their intellectual interests, the activists report themselves more often than nonactivists as having been influenced by ideas presented in courses and by teachers. Finally, students with different majors are not equally represented among the activists. Students from business and engineering programs are hardly present at all. In two Berkeley studies, the social sciences were overrepresented among the activists, while the overrepresentation of humanities majors was slight.

The high academic aptitudes, interests, and achievements of the activists seem to justify Somers' remark that they are "a minority vital to the excellence of this university." That the activists are recruited particularly from the intellectually able and interested students may well be explained by the observation that these are the students who care for the intellectual values implied in the university, who have been stimulated by the pursuit of truth and expression of heterodox ideas in their courses, who now want an extension and deepening of these experiences, and who would like to relate ideas and theories to their own lives and to the improvement of the society around them. It also ought to be noted that the student movement has been particularly active at universities of the highest quality (California, Chicago, Michigan,Wisconsin)--a tribute, it might be argued, to these institutions for allowing their students to overcome the apathy which seemed almost ineradicable in the 1950's. At least one university president is quoted as having expressed his envy that a movement like the FSM was not possible on his campus.

Personality Characteristics and Values

Activist students, measured by a variety of personality instruments, consistently score significantly higher not only on the dimensions of theoretical orientation and aesthetic sensitivity as already reported, but also in their degree of psychological autonomy, social maturity, tendency to express feelings and impulses directly, and lack of authoritarianism. This means that activists, according to these measures, tend to be more flexible, tolerant, and realistic;

less dependent upon authority, rules, or rituals for managing social relationships; less judgmental; they tend to express impulses more freely either in conscious thought or in overt action; they have an active imagination; they tend to be independent of authority as traditionally imposed through social institutions and oppose infringement on the rights of individuals. In one study where personality data for the students arrested as freshmen were available, the activists turned out to be significantly different in these personality dimensions from their classmates upon entrance. In their values, activists tend to be concerned with self-expression, intellectual orientation, sense of community with and responsibility for their fellow men; while the nonactivists tend to be more success-oriented, self-denying, conventional, competitive, self-controlled, foresightful, and orderly. Activists tend to express a much greater dedication than do nonactivists to work for national and international betterment and toward humanitarian objectives. They score lower on ethnocentric prejudices.

These psychological measures indicate that in the activists we seem to be dealing with people who have a rich and complex inner life, a more pronounced sensitivity, responsiveness to and a greater need of other people, and stronger humanitarian and idealistic tendencies than is average. One might think of them as psychologically rich people who are likely to smart under institutional conditions that restrict their opportunity for personal experience, sensitivity, and intense communication with other people. At the same time, their psychological capacities for autonomy and initiative prevent them from choosing the withdrawing kind of protest that characterizes the alienated person. The activist has a special capacity to express and perhaps even integrate his impulses and feelings, instead of denying them and consigning them to partial atrophy. Thus, a psychiatric observer of the activists recently asserted that "activism is, presently, a generally healthy aspect of the process of maturation."[25]

These students are not nature's psychological noblemen. No human group is: the unconscious, with its vast and contradictory impetuosity, sees to that. But in the light of often unfavorable descriptions of the activists in the press and in some educational circles, it is of major interest that they turn out to be people of some psychological attractiveness in the strength and richness of their intellectual, aesthetic, and emotional endowment.

Activists constitute only one of the groupings in the colleges. A further understanding of them can be reached by contrasting them with other groups or types present in the undergraduate community. Keniston suggests that the "professionalist" is becoming the predominant type particularly at the more selective private universities and liberal arts colleges, replacing the gentleman, the big man on campus, and the upwardly mobile "apprentice" of earlier days. "What is new about

American students today is the growing number of academically committed young men and women who value technical, intellectual, and professional competence above popularity, ambition, or grace."[26] To achieve this goal requires continual diligence and performance in school. The professional's is an academic orientation rather than an intellectual one. "Students often unhappily admit to a fear of 'getting too interested in their work' because it might jeopardize the detachment they would otherwise bring to getting good grades."[27] In comparison with the professionalists, Keniston thinks of the activists, the alienated, and the underachievers as "deviant" types. ("The underachiever is the student who accepts the values of the university and the society--but with them his own inadequacy.")

In their study of adolescents, Block, Haan, and Smith ordered the social and political behavior of young people on the following continuum: (1) politically apathetic youths who tend to accept the the status quo and focus primarily on their own individual lives, with little concern for the long-term problems of society; (2) alienated youths ("hippies" or "beats") who have rejected these traditional values of society, who do not participate in the political-social arena, and who escape from the culture by "opting out," to live an egocentric and aesthetically oriented life; (3) individualist or conservative youths who accept the traditional American values and authority structure, whose commitments are directed to maintaining the status quo or re-establishing an era of unhampered individualism (some of this group are greatly influenced by the individualism of Ayn Rand); (4) activist youths who have rejected major values of contemporary society and have dedicated themselves to fight, demonstrate, and protest against policies and institutions that violate their ethics and sense of human justice; (5) constructivist youths who occupy an intermediate position on acceptance or rejection of authority and existing institutions, but are highly involved with political and social problems, devoting themselves to restitutive work in hospitals, ghettoes, or in tutoring children;[28] and (6) anti-social youths whose rebellion lacks moral or ethical justification and is characterized by minimal social involvement.

The case of the conservative offers some special problems in the present context. As Bay has recently noted, conservatism and lack of interest in politics can be taken to mean the same thing. Conservatism is often identified with the attempt to preserve the status quo. Yet there are groups that can be described, as they were by Lawrence Schiff, as "conservative activists."[29] Is the definition of activism, then, politically neutral and can it comprehend students on both left and right? This depends on the definitional criteria. At any rate, conservative activists are different from other activists in other than ideological ways. In his study of converts to conservatism, Schiff found his subjects characterized by identity foreclosure and obedience--

traits of the very opposite kind from those found in the studies of the activists previously cited.[30]

Finally, there are the questions of what type and how many institutions favor an active student movement and whether the issues are different on different campuses. In a survey of the scope of organized student protest in 1964-65, Richard Peterson found, based on reports of student deans, that the following had been, in descending order, the most frequent issues in organized student protests: (1) civil rights locally (38 percent of the reporting institutions); (2) food service (29 percent), (3) dormitory and other living group regulations (28 percent),and (4) U. S. policies regarding Vietnam (21 percent). Activist protest of the sort discussed in this monograph took place disproportionately often in selective colleges and universities. Unfortunately, no similar survey has been published for 1965-66. Informal evidence gathered from student newspapers and observations of campuses across the country seems to suggest that more students have become sympathetic to the activist ideology, that more expression has been given to these attitudes on more campuses, and that formerly non-reform-minded student leaders, such as newspaper editors or political office holders, have espoused activist causes--often in a quieter manner than that of the outright activist. But the exact determination of the spread of activist sentiment and behavior awaits further research.

V. IMPLICATIONS FOR COLLEGE POLICY

What are the consequences of the rise of activism for the governance and conduct of undergraduate education? There is no doubt that the student movement has made a major difference in the climate of opinion in the colleges and universities; in particular, it has focused attention in a major way on the student himself. Before 1964 only a relatively small group of researchers, student deans, psychiatrists, college teachers, and other educators had been insisting that many important educational and personal needs of the student were not being met. By taking matters into their own hands, students were able not only to dramatize their discontent and the existing conditions, but also to bring about many changes. Many university officials from presidents on down were replaced as the more or less direct result of student protest. Important changes in social rules and regulations were effected by student pressure. Greater representation of students on policy, administration, and study committees of their universities has come about. The Muscatine Report at Berkeley proposing reform and a permanent Board of Educational Development--the faculty has since voted in favor of many of these proposals--was the direct result of the Berkeley demonstrations.

Students thus have become a new power, and a previous equilibrium in the political configuration of the university has been upset. As suggested earlier, given the relative lack of organization among students and the absence of an ideological master plan, the further development of this new student power is yet uncertain. But, as a look at student newspapers across the country will indicate, students and activists in particular are calling for far more radical changes in the curricular, social, and administrative arrangements of the university than have yet been attempted almost anywhere. In some of the curricular and administrative areas many students call for considerably expanded student participation and in many social areas there is a call for student autonomy. In regard to social codes, within the last few years a subtle change seems to have taken place, particularly in the more unconventional students. The former desire to argue it out with the adult authorities has changed to an attitude in which the adults' position and objectives are felt, often benignly, to be irrelevant to the new morality students are trying to forge for themselves.

At this point there still are many uncertainties; tension and conflict are both actual and potential in the relations between students and administration, and students and faculty. In 1965 Byrne described the situation for the University of California as one characterized, among other things, by a vague spelling-out of administrative responsibilities for students, by sporadic and infrequent consultation with students, and by a lack of serious consideration given to students' views even when students were consulted. This was fairly characteristic of the situation in other large universities and even in many, if not most, smaller institutions. Since 1965 there has been more confrontation between administrators and students. That confrontation has taken different forms on different campuses. At the extreme, as Sampson points out, students would define the administration as "the enemy in residence" and consider any action a failure that did not provoke angry, negative reactions. This is perhaps particularly likely to happen when students are viewed politically rather than educationally. Wolin and Schaar[31] describe a situation of mounting estrangement:

> The students theorized that they were confronting a "power structure" bound by strong and subtle links to the larger power structures of state and nation. The objectives of the national power elite were empire abroad and suppression of dissent at home. The University Administration's target was "the student movement," which stood for peace, civil rights, and radical social change. Hence, if the Administration won, the children of light lost. During the struggle every Administration move had to be probed for its "real" meanings. This view, obviously, made no allowance for mistakes, accidents, or common stupidity, let alone for good will.
>
> The Administration had its own version of the power elite theory: in its view the University's troubles were the work of a hard core of non-student agitators, plus a small number of student activists, who persistently abused the generous freedoms allowed on campus. Their goal was either to wreck the University or take it over. The "silent majority" of unpolitical students and a few hundred unrealistic faculty members had been duped by the agitators, thereby aggravating the Administration's task.

In other places, student-administration confrontations have been more benign; differences have been settled without the use of police force.[32] As we have indicated, in many institutions students have been able to gain important concessions. The peace, however, is an uneasy one, and the situation has been further complicated by the fact that the faculty, who in 1964 seemed natural allies to many students, with some exceptions have not taken strong initiative in support of students, particularly once a dramatic crisis was over.

This difficulty of communications may be explained by the fact that the different sectors of the university have different interests and tend to pull in different directions. Briefly, this internal institutional divergence may be described as follows.

(1) The president and other members of the administration are strongly concerned with institutional preservation and expansion. They are in some sense like industrial managers or managers of large hotels who want to see that the plant or organization is in adequate shape to keep up with the needs of the market. The classroom and the students are only two of the many internal operations, such as new buildings, housing, personnel, budget, to which they need to attend. Equally in their domain are the university's relations with the outside: financing, alumni, parents, the public, and legislators. Their task is not made easier by the public's inadequate understanding of good educational methods and of the developmental needs of young people.

(2) Faculty members have been trained and tend to be primarily concerned with the development of their specialty and with the preservation and expansion of departmental operations. To many of them, students have maximum value as actual or "would-be" recruits for their profession--though the process of teaching has moved many teachers to pay attention to what students might get out of the classroom for their own personal benefit.[33]

(3) The students' interests--besides that of gaining the social and economic benefits they derive from college attendance, and, for some, of gaining some preprofessional preparation--are strongly in the direction of developing themselves personally, deepening their capacity for association with other people, and, if possible, gaining some greater mastery of the complexity and mysteriousness of life that many of them at this age tend to feel vividly. To have as good a time as possible is another of their objectives. The activists, in addition, demand that the university serve the role of agent in political and social change.

The "housekeeping" disposition of the administration, the professional disposition of the faculty, and the developmental disposition of the student are part of three different ways of life; to some extent, each of the three sectors interferes with what to one or the other is, or seems, a vital objective. Thus, students seem to interfere with research or with maintaining smooth relations with the public. Students, on their part, often feel that they would not voluntarily do some or many of the things asked of them by faculty or administration.

This divergence of "life styles" in the three sectors of the college or university seems to indicate that the potential for tension and conflict is built in. Misunderstanding is often enhanced further by the fact that the students look at the situation not from an institutional perspective but from a moral and an affective one. They expect administration and faculty to live up to very high moral principles and to be models of moral leadership.[34] They also tend to see their large institution as an analogue of the family and expect relationships with administrators and faculty to resemble parental ones (with respect to both closeness and distance or opposition they show to their own parents).

It is likely that, during times of internal tensions, disappointed hopes for moral leadership or for more equal participation in the university turn students toward more political or legal definitions of their relationship to the university. Such a turn often is a symptom of a breakdown in communication--just as in divorce the resort to legal procedures and maneuvering indicates the partial or total breakdown of other forms of communication. Wolin and Schaar[35] describe this defensive use of legal procedures.

> Ever since 1964, the students had castigated the University for its bureaucratism, its maze of rules, and its

> intricate procedures. Now they were demanding additional rules, new procedures, and more machinery. Having first attacked the machine, the students next complicated its structure, and were now demanding a greater part in running it.

As far as the administration is concerned, Wolin and Schaar say in the next paragraph:

> The Administration's deepest intellectual and moral failure was its failure to understand that it was directing an educational community. Its deepest psychological and political failure was lack of political foresight. It was willing to use force--even outside police force--to secure order, but it was silent as to how it would then gain the future trust, cooperation, and enthusiasm of those whom it had determined to pacify.

But while a special emphasis on the legal aspects of the students' relation to their university seems in itself a symptom of trouble, there are other considerations that must be adduced concerning the function of legal definitions and procedures. Attending a college has important consequences for a student's economic and social future. Hence, any threat of expulsion or even of a bad record assumes major importance, and students in the recent past have been pressing for some of the methods of due process, including the aid of legal counsel in such cases.

Moreover, as the research by Williamson and Cowan[36] indicates, there is great variation in the rights students enjoy in the 849 different institutions studied. The student editor, they report, is seldom a free agent. "At 42 percent of American colleges, editors are required to submit copy to someone before publication . . . 35 percent of the editors who had to submit copy reported that censorship had actually occurred against their wishes."[37] About half the editors report that they had been privately censured after publication, and close to one-fourth reported public censure. Practices vary widely in different institutions as to students' freedom to invite controversial speakers, or to engage in demonstrations or civil rights activities. "Students have voting participation in policy-making committees in about two-thirds of American colleges, but their actual influence in these committees is reportedly limited."[38]

Thus, given the fact that student-administration or student-faculty relations are not confined to Mark Hopkins' log, but take place within a highly complex physical and social organization, legal processes may be expected to serve positive and negative functions similar to those they serve elsewhere in the society. It is not yet clear to what extent there will be continued and expanded pressure by students for the introduction of more legal definitions and procedures.

The intrainstitutional rights of the students--the exercise of which is also viewed as an educational opportunity--have been included in a "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" issued in January, 1967, by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing

Boards of Universities and Colleges. Students are to be given at least these opportunities:

> (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.[39]

The reader of this monograph will realize these demands are modest when compared with the demands of activists and even nonactivist students; one might also express some surprise over a situation that still requires the formulation of these objectives.

As we have seen, activist and many nonactivist students are opposed to a system of evaluation that makes them conform to standards they feel are not compatible with the development of their intellectual competence. They want a redefinition of subject matter so that it will give them information and methods which can help them further their own tentative thinking about human nature, society, history, and natural objects. They want instruction in a context of more human contact with teachers and among students themselves. They want more freedom in making their own living arrangements, and at the same time they want the living arrangements to make intellectual and emotional communication more possible. They want their university, their faculty, and their administrators not only to be articulate critics of existing injustices in society, but also, by working with students, to show them the way toward acting on the basis of these criticisms.

Many of the demands of the students are developmental. They want college to be a place in which they are helped toward self-discovery, toward managing and more clearly defining their many undefined and half-defined and threatening impulses. They want to be helped toward making the right kind of decision for their occupational future and toward acquiring the capacities that make for mutually helpful human relations.

Faculty members, having their own cognitive and professional models in mind, may consider these aspirations as irrelevant or only partially relevant, and yet this very attitude only widens the gap between them and the students whose aspirations may be more or less articulate. Perhaps the most troublesome problem for most administrators and faculty members is their lack of any profound knowledge about students. Such knowledge does not come easily. Help can be gained from research on one's own campus. But research results are going to seem unduly abstract unless they are coupled with one's own intense observations and associations. Relations between students and administrators are often so formalized and so much defined by the authority structure that students can afford to show only a rather superficial side of themselves, whether it be graceful or antagonistic. The classroom, often dominated by the fact that the teacher is evaluating the student and thereby determining some part of his future, may also be a poor place for students and teachers to get to know each other. The classroom calls for what students term the adoption of "masks."

In a climate of mutual strangeness it has become possible to view student demands as a "disturbance," and it has frequently been difficult to become aware of the profounder aspirations that may be expressed in the often only half-articulate language of protest. Estrangement has also given rise to the treatment of students as a political force, thereby further removing confrontation from the educational to the political plane. A defensive stance by teachers or administrators also tends to deprive students of the leadership they implicitly desire. Students are only too strongly aware of their deficiencies in knowledge and experience; and they are, if anything, overly prone to accept guidance, or even dictation. It is only when they feel great unresponsiveness that they are driven to reject adults. Still, if given the choice, they would prefer to be apprentices to adults who show moral strength and intellectual skills in ways that are congruent with the student's objectives for his own growth.

In the absence of adequate ready-made arrangements, students, in the past and present, have developed their own institutions and their own cultures. In recent years, students have been finding their own patterns of social service, social participation, and moral renewal. The various "free universities" and "experiments" founded by students over the last two or three years show that they are also looking for new patterns of learning. By observing and participating in these spontaneous student creations,[40] the older generation can learn much about the genuine objectives of young people and can eventually transform established educational arrangements. It is perhaps even more important that the universities do not react with anxiety or suppression to the students' own creations. Societies, like individuals, cannot be improved without going through disequilibrium. The availability of fresh and divergent experiences is essential for the success of the adolescent's quest for self-knowledge and self-definition.

Finally, in spite of the jolt that institutions have received in the last few years, there has not been enough effort to search out the underlying causes of student protest. There has been even less attempt to modify substantially the relevant educational arrangements. Until this happens, one may safely predict continued clashes, or as an alternative, a fresh retreat to apathy.

VI. QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Even among social scientists, the tendency is to study people and events at some distance from the actual happening and at relatively high levels of abstraction. The research studies on the activists constitute a happy exception. Social scientists were present as the events were happening--for instance, they were on the steps of Sproul Hall as the students were entering for their sit-in. They were thus able to question subjects while reactions were fresh and not yet overlaid by repeated reminiscing, and they were able to get subjects in sufficient numbers. Moreover, the quick availability of the results of some of these surveys was of great practical usefulness. The findings contradicted myths in which people already firmly believed, such as the notions that the activists were academically inferior, psychologically depraved, politically extreme, primarily non-students, or led by sinister outsiders. The theoretical and practical gains of the immediate presence of researchers make it plausible to suggest an institutional arrangement which assures that social scientists be present whenever there is a major crisis or other dramatic event. (Teams or individuals might be designated in advance who would be ready to go into action if a specific type of event in their area of research occurred.)

The research problems raised by the activists are of an interesting variety. Thus, the study of activists, principally because of their more expressive psychological behavior, affords us an opportunity to increase our knowledge of the psychological disposition and development of young people in general. A sociologist can study the nature and degree of flexibility of the response of institutions and its personnel to crises. The political scientist can view the student-administration confrontation as a replication in miniature of conflict encountered in domestic or international relations. He might perhaps also be moved to study or experiment with approaches to conflict resolution in this situation, hopefully relatively benign, using it as a model for conflict resolution in other sociopolitical areas. Studying the educational scene thus promises contributions to areas of knowledge that have usually not been associated with educational research. The student of revolutions, of conflict resolution, of institutional organization and viability, of personality development--all can gather rich data right on the campus. This realization may attract more researchers to the study of colleges and universities.

Besides the need for further observational research, there is at present a great need to begin trying out new modes of teaching and of student participation in the curricular and noncurricular life of their institution--with research serving to assess and evaluate these attempts at innovation, and with further theory developing out of the study of induced change.

Students themselves have had their eye on research. Among some activists there is opposition to research, which they see--not necessarily unjustly--as a delaying device on the part of those who wish to maintain the status quo. Other activist student groups have recently indicated a desire to sponsor and pay for their own research. This will in itself be interesting to watch. For one may expect that some of the questions raised in student-sponsored research--even if the methods of research conform to the usual standards--will be different from those raised in research sponsored by others. Some of the student questions will turn out to be "embarrassing" and will raise anew the questions of the valuational and subjective starting points of research.

There are many specific questions for further research raised by the emergence of activism. We have acquired or are acquiring knowledge of the personality characteristics and the background of activists.[41] But we need to know more about the processes and outcomes of their attempts to find "new and workable truths" for their lives.

Follow-up studies of activists would help determine the lasting impact on behavior and character structure that is caused by participation in activism. It would help answer such questions as whether activist involvement encourages the development of initiative and of constructively innovative behavior in later settings, as when activists become faculty members or members of other organizations. We could learn much from a study of the activist modes of political organization, of decision-making, and of translating ideas into action.[42]

The activists' own spontaneous creations, such as the "free universities" and the "experiments" that have sprung up on or near many campuses, provide an opportunity for studying the students' own conceptions of their intellectual and social needs and their own practices of learning and of self-rule. The successes and failures of these experiments may also provide important lessons for the established educational institutions.

Studying the different responses of administrators and faculty to student demands and student unrest in different institutions across the country would increase our knowledge of successful and unsuccessful ways (a) of achieving political accommodation and (b) of making educational use of dissent. Differences among institutions in the nature and scope of organized student protest should continue to be studied. Why do institutions differ in the degree and kinds of protest? Why do some have panty raids or their equivalent while others have educational reform movements?

Studying the impact of the activists on nonactivist students and the ways in which these two groups relate to each other would make clear to what extent the activist influence is educational, to what extent neutral, and to what extent productive of defensive resistance. Such a study would also help to develop some guidelines for the as yet underdeveloped art of bringing people who *differ* from each other into mutually beneficial associations.

A listing of questions for further research can only be illustrative. But it should be quite clear that educational, social, and psychological theory as well as educational practice can gain much from these studies.

FOOTNOTES

1. Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, The New Radicals: A Report with Documents, p. 94-95. New York, Random House, 1966.

2. The question of how to define "activism" will be taken up later. But it should be made clear at the outset that the author uses the term in a more inclusive sense which comprehends not only acts of protest and demonstrations, but also other attitudes and behavior directed toward the transformation of existing educational, social, and political shortcomings.

3. Op. cit., p. 5.

4. Anna Freud, "Consultation with the Committee on the College Student." New Haven, Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, 1963. Mimeographed.

5. Bradford Cleaveland, "A Letter to Undergraduates." Reprinted in S. M. Lipset and S. S. Wolin, The Berkeley Student Revolt, p. 66-68. New York, Anchor Books, 1965.

6. Lipset and Wolin, op. cit., p. 209-10.

7. Joseph Katz, "Personality Characteristics of Students Arrested During the Berkeley Sit-in of 1964." In Psychological Development and the Impact of the College. (Forthcoming report to the U. S. Office of Education and the Danforth Foundation.)

8. To stress these similarities is not meant to minimize the fact that many activists argue that the existing reform and political programs are inadequate in definition and execution.

9. Jerome C. Byrne, Report to the Forbes Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of California, May, 1965. See also Robert H. Somers. "The Mainsprings of the Rebellion: A Survey of Berkeley Students in November, 1964." In Lipset and Wolin, op. cit., p. 538.

10. A study undertaken by Barry Sokolik at the Institute for the Study

of Human Problems at Stanford indicated that the students who voted for the activist did not necessarily agree with his ideas in detail, but felt there was need for reform.

11. Clark Kerr, the former president of the University of California, writes: "Unwise use of police can build up new and different tensions and antagonisms that otherwise would not exist. Too ready use of police is counter-productive. If the public will allow time, the great majority of the demonstrating students will return to normal democratic procedures . . . . If you were hauled down the steps with your head bumping, you wouldn't forget it for the rest of your life. That's why I am concerned, in the present atmosphere, over the myth that the heavy hand is the best and even the only solution . . . . Stanford students sat in the president's office for three days last year; nobody called the police, and the students were only placed on probation. At Wisconsin, 1,000 students held a five-day sit-in. Nobody was penalized or hauled off. The president of the University of Chicago didn't enter his office for two weeks because of a sit-in at his door, but this episode was not turned into continuing warfare. Michigan, City College of New York, and Cornell have also held off the heavy hand. And peace returned quickly to these campuses." Kerr said about Berkeley that "the University has been charged with not being stern enough. This is absolutely untrue. There has been no heavier hand on any campus in the United States than at Berkeley. That's part of the problem." (Clark Kerr with G. B. Leonard and T. G. Harris, "The Turmoil in Higher Education." Look, p. 18. April 18, 1967.)

12. Glen Lyonns, "The Police Car Demonstration: A Survey of Participants." In Lipset and Wolin, op. cit., p. 524.

13. Lipset and Wolin, op. cit., p. 80.

14. Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 144 ff. New York, Vintage Books, 1965.

15. Ibid., p. 369 ff.

16. Hans Kohn, "Youth Movements." In Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York, Macmillan, 1935.

17. For a detailed survey of student movements and activities of the recent past in countries around the world, see Seymour Martin Lipset, "University Students and Politics in Underdeveloped Countries." Comparative Education Review, vol. 10, p. 132-62. 1966. He shows how students have been an important force in bringing about political and social changes and have also at times tried to alter the governance

or teaching in their institutions. An instance of the latter is the Latin American University Reform Movement which began in 1918 "demanding a greater emphasis on the social and physical sciences and changes in the university government so as to give increased power to representatives of the staff and students" (p. 145). In regard to students' political influence, Lipset makes the suggestion that both Marxian and non-Marxian scholars in focusing on the role of the workers or the "proletariat" have neglected to examine the revolutionary impact of students. He points out the students in Poland and Hungary in 1956 who played a major role in the movement to liberalize the totalitarian regime; and in Russia, university students were "among the few to engage in demonstrations demanding freedom and major economic reforms from the mid-nineteenth century on. Many of these early protests began as struggles for greater rights for students within the university and than widened their objectives as they met with repression" (p. 137); in the underdeveloped countries students trained abroad have furnished many of the leaders working for political and social change and technological advance.

18. C. Earl Timothy, a senior in social science at San Francisco State College, has written: "There exists in America a systematic attempt on the part of the established educational elite to move the line of demarcation between the world of the adult and the world of the child to a progressively older age . . . . The general trend in turn is due to the reluctance on the part of those with power to allow the creative and revolutionary things brought into the world by new people to ever be actualized by adults." See his "At Stake is a Chance for Survival." In Otto Butz, ed., To Make a Difference--A Student Look at America. New York, Harper & Row, 1967.

19. Newfield gives the estimated membership of SDS on April 1, 1966, as 5,500 in 151 chapters in 37 states. He adds that for every member, five others take part in the activities. (Jack Newfield, A Prophetic Minority. New York, New American Library, 1966.) Schiff in 1964 described the rightist group of Young Americans for Freedom having "upwards of 10,000 campus members. (Lawrence F. Schiff, "The Obedient Rebels." Journal of Social Issues, vol. 20, p. 75. 1964.) A more recent report of the president of YAF claims a membership of more than 75,000. (S. M. Lipset and P. G. Altbach, "Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States." Comparative Education Review, vol. 10, p. 325. 1966.) The total college population is about six million.

20. Where to include users of drugs, particularly of marijuana, raises further problems. Richard Goldstein, a graduate student in journalism, writes on the basis of extensive interviews conducted on

campuses throughout the country: "Some are searching for an easy, cheap high. Some are searching for rebellion, some are searching for status, some are searching for distraction. And some are searching for new and workable truths about their lives." (Richard Goldstein, _1 in 7: Drugs on Campus_, p. 161. New York, Walker, 1966.) The whole gamut from thrill-seeking to serious self-searching seems to be involved here. Goldstein also writes that students "choose to consume only those drugs which they think are clearly labeled 'non-addictive'" (p. 93), and that the college ethos emphasizes the importance of control. He quotes a woman student: "Don't worry about the campus iconoclasts. They keep within very safe limits. You have to be in perfect control to enjoy your cool" (p. 57). There has been repudiation by activists of drug-taking as a temptation to retreat and as endangering social effectiveness--as when members of the New Left criticized others as the "Pot Left." Informal estimates for the larger colleges made by apparently knowledgeable people put the approximate average of marijuana users at 15 percent. A careful study by Richard and Eva Blum of drug-taking at several different types of colleges and universities is under way at the Institute for the Study of Human Problems at Stanford University.

21. Sheldon S. Wolin and John H. Schaar, "Berkeley and the University Revolution." _New York Review of Books_, p. 18. February 9, 1967.

22. Jeanne H. Block, Norma Haan, and H. Brewster Smith, "Activism and Apathy in Contemporary Adolescents." In J. F. Adams, ed., _Contributions to the Understanding of Adolescence_. Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1967. The authors distinguish "constructivist" from "activist" youths. The former are youths who devote themselves to restitutive work in voluntary activities in hospitals, ghettoes, and Peace Corps projects. They are defined as trying to effect change _within_ the existing framework of society. The authors also say that the constructivists overlap to some extent with the activists. Because of this overlap and the fluid boundaries--depending in part on the reaction of college officials and other authorities--between rejection and acceptance of the established framework, this writer tends to think of constructivism as an essential ingredient of activism. Some of the rhetoric of certain of the activist spokesman, particularly in moments of crisis, sounds less constructive, but strong rejection seems to characterize activism only at the fringes.

23. Philo B. Baumgartner, a graduate student at San Francisco State College, writes: "I, like so many others in this culture, have been conditioned to ignore my own inner feelings, and to seek myself in the plethora of mirror images around me." See Butz, _op. cit_, p. 92.

24. Only Watts and Whittaker found that their FSM sample did not achieve a significantly higher grade-point average. Heist and Katz found the grade-point average significantly higher for their FSM sample as based on the registrar's data, and Somers found this to be true based on students' self-reports. Flacks reports similar results for Chicago. The differences in SAT verbal scores were computed by Katz alone for his data.

25. Robert S. Berns, "The Activist Student." Paper read at annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, Detroit, 1967.

26. Kenneth Keniston, "The Faces in the Lecture Room." In R. S. Morison, ed., The Contemporary University: U. S. A., p. 328-29. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

27. Ibid., p. 330.

28. As indicated earlier, this writer amalgamates the categories of activist and constructivist youth.

29. Lipset and Altbach, op. cit., write that right-wing student activities probably still include many more students in membership than does the organized left, but while well-represented in the large universities, they have much of their backing in "schools which are not leaders in intellectual life." Right-wing students have been active in organizing mass meetings, petitions, and blood-donor campaigns, but they have not "generally aimed at substantial social changes in the society." Their objective has been, rather, to limit "the influence of liberalism and collectivism which they see as the dominant trend on the American campus" (p. 324-25).

30. On the basis of a survey of research studies, Bay has argued at length in favor of the point that the frequencies of repressed anxieties about one's own worth and about one's acceptability to others are probably higher among conservatives than nonconservatives.

31. Wolin and Schaar, op. cit., p. 18-19.

32. See 11 above.

33. The relative lack of interest in students is given evidence by the fact that only very rarely has psychological or sociological research into the students' development or situation been initiated by administration or faculty. The research that has been done has often been due to the initiative and interest of the researchers themselves. Faculty members, moreover, have shown little inclination to study the effects

of their presentation on students while in the classroom or at a time after the course is completed.

34. Nevitt Sanford, "Leadership for Improved Conditions for Learning and Research." Presented at annual meeting of the Association for Higher Education, 1967. (This article is due to appear in *Current Issues in Higher Education.*)

35. Wolin and Schaar, *op. cit.* p. 19.

36. E. G. Williamson and John L. Cowan, *The American Student's Freedom of Expression--A Research Appraisal*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1966.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 129.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 152.

39. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 13, 1967.

40. As far as I know, the student-run experiments have remained unstudied.

41. A study of the family background of activists by Block, Haan, and Smith is under way at Berkeley.

42. Byrne in his report to the Regents of the University of California in 1965 characterized the students' skills in this area as superior to those of the university administration. "Even though the student protestants represented a great diversity of views and persuasions, and against the fact that hours of debate preceded most of their decisions, the leadership was capable of decisive action rooted in genuine support from its constituency. The same cannot be said of University leadership: we refer to the President, the Chancellor, and the officers of the University in combination. University leadership was indecisive, uncertain, split in several dimensions, uncoordinated, and unable to gain the support of its own constituency."

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Dennis, Lawrence E., and Joseph F. Kauffman, The College and the Student: An Assessment of Relationships and Responsibilities in Undergraduate Education by Administrators, Faculty Members, and Public Officials. Washington, American Council on Education, 1966. 390 p.

Most of the 46 papers in this volume were first presented at the annual meeting of the American Council on Education in Washington when educators were freshly under the impact of the recent student uprisings. Focusing the meeting on the student seemed particularly appropriate. The various authors discuss the general social situation in which the student finds himself, his academic environment, his legal rights, his moral aspirations, and the stresses under which he works.

Many of the contributors are people long engaged in research on college students or other aspects of higher education. The following three are illustrative. Robert Pace reports from his research on college environments that, among the institutions studied by him, intense interest in politics and social problems is characteristic only of high-prestige liberal arts colleges. A lack of restrictiveness and close supervision is most characteristic of high-prestige liberal arts colleges, universities, and state colleges. (This finding agrees with the findings of Williamson and Cowan reported below.) Theodore Newcomb's paper in part is based on his researches of student peer relations, and he advocates reduction in size "not of the total institution, but of the functional units within which students interact with each other and their teachers." Lewis Mayhew reviews the literature and various theories in order to identify the elements of the collegiate environment which have special relevance for learning. They are "the balance, and organization of the curriculum, the total college climate, the size of the unit within which learning takes place, the degree of personal interaction with some faculty, the student subculture and the various subgroupings within it, the administrative point of view, the campus itself, the interaction on the campus, the self-selection which creates a given student body, the prevailing educational philosophy or lack of it, the presence or absence of role models, the blending of learning and living, the operative environment, and the reward system."

2. Fishman, Jacob R., and Frederic Solomon, eds., "Youth and Social Action." Journal of Social Issues, vol. 20, whole issue. 1964.

The articles in this issue cover a wide variety of youth groups: civil rights workers, peace demonstrators, activist conservatives, mental health volunteers, Negro youths, and contemporary Japanese youths. The intent of the issue is to describe the "psycho-social determinants underlying both valued and disvalued, pro-social and anti-social actions."

Lawrence Schiff ("The Obedient Rebels: A Study of College Conversions to Conservatism") reports that his conservative subjects were characterized by "obedient rebellion" and identity foreclosure. They had a need to assert themselves, but could do so only in a context of deference to legitimate authority and the sanctity of traditional morality. At the same time, their ideology functioned for them as a vehicle for the displacement of otherwise inexpressible hostility.

Solomon and Fishman ("Youth and Peace: A Psychosocial Study of Student Peace Demonstrators in Washington, D. C.") report that the demonstrators were young--mean age was 18 1/2 years--had no well-formulated political ideology, but strong moral feelings against war, came from politically liberal families, but were "rebelling" in going far beyond their parents in action. A group of conservative students who were counter-picketing differed markedly from the peace demonstrators in many parameters of belief and behavior and were characterized by strong distrust.

Gelineau and Kantor ("Pro-Social Commitment Among College Students") studied Harvard and Radcliffe students who volunteered to work in mental hospitals. The authors were able to identify five styles of handling the experience of working with schizophrenics--the differences in styles implying that the same activity had different meanings and different effects for different people. The five styles were professional (training for future work), political (concerned with how the institution functions), social (seeking social relationships with staff and patients), moral (doing something about suffering), and existential (valuing the experience for its own sake).

Other contributors to the issue: Erik H. Erikson, "A Memorandum on Identity and Negro Youth"; Robert Coles, "A Matter of Territory"; and Robert Jay Lifton, "Individual Patterns in Historical Change: Imagery of Japanese Youth."

3. Jacobs, Paul, and Saul Landau, The New Radicals: A Report with Documents. New York, Random House, 1966. 333 p.

This book is about the origins, development, and present status of the "Movement," that is, the various groups of young people in the 1960's whose dissatisfaction with political and social conditions at home and abroad has led them to try to change society through social action. In the first 85 pages of the book, the authors devote a chapter each to the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), Marxist groups (the Progressive Labor Movement, the DuBois Clubs), the Free Speech Movement (FSM), and the Vietnam Day Committee (VDC). The authors argue that the Movement is concerned with more than civil rights and the war, that its real significance is centered in its repudiation of depersonalization of human relations and of a materialist approach to life. They say that the Movement's problem is to find an ideology, not simply to react to situations in an ad hoc way. The remaining 248 pages of the book consist of documents--articles, interviews, poems--by people involved in the Movement.

4. Keniston, Kenneth, The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965. 500 p.

This book has two parts. The first is a psychological study of alienation in a group of highly able, talented, and socially privileged college students. The second is a discussion of how American society today breeds alienation.

The psychological study of alienation is based on an intensive three-year investigation of the backgrounds, personalities, and development of 12 Harvard undergraduate students who presented a picture of extreme alienation on psychological tests. An extremely nonalienated and a moderate control group also was studied. Superficially, these 12 alienated students differed little from the rest of the Harvard students, but they were outstanding in their rejection of and feeling of estrangement from their families and American society, and in their lack of commitment to people or causes. Intensive clinical study of these students revealed that they shared a common perception of their families. They saw mother as an especially gifted woman who sacrificed her life to marry a man who was seen as weak and compromising (a sell-out in the eyes of their sons). In each case, the mother-son relationship grew intense, the mother turning to the son for emotional gratification that she felt the husband did not provide. The sons, unable to admire and emulate their fathers, could not accept the responsibilities or assume the commitments of being an adult since being adult meant being like father.

Although the immediate personal and family situation of the subjects may have predisposed them to alienation, the author contends that their alienation cannot be understood without also understanding what they were alienated from--the society that was alienating them. In the second half of the book he traces these alienating forces: chronic change, social fragmentation, the separation of family and work life, decline of idealism, and the demands for high levels of specialization, for adaptability, and for peak performance.

5. Lipset, Seymour Martin, ed., "Student Politics." Comparative Education Review, vol. 10, No. 2, p. 129-376. 1966.

The entire book-length issue is devoted to the role of students in politics and higher education. There are 16 articles reporting research findings and offering interpretations covering student politics in developed and "underdeveloped" countries all over the globe, with special attention being given to Latin America, India, and the United States. The editor writes in his preface that "it is important to note that the campus has not suddenly exploded, that there is a substantial tradition of student political concern and activity, and that students have played an important role in revolutionary movements through the years." The articles that follow go on to show the effects that various student movements have had on the politics and institutions of their country, including sometimes effects on the curriculum and governance of their universities. Many of the articles have a long list of references, thus making this issue also a valuable bibliographical resource.

Lipset and Altbach, in their article on "Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States," survey and discuss the American student movement of the 1960's. The authors compare the American student movement with those in other countries and suggest that the relatively sporadic appearance of student activism in the United States reflects institutional differences and differences in the political and social status of students in different countries. In regard to academic differences, the authors write: "In the United States, students are examined regularly and must be fairly well prepared if they are to continue in the university. In many of the developing nations and parts of Europe, however, examinations take place at yearly intervals (or even less often), thus allowing considerable leeway for outside student activities . . . . The full program of extracurricular activities not related to politics which is afforded in most American universities also decreases student political participation."

6. Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Sheldon S. Wolin, eds. The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations. New York, Anchor Books, 1965. 585 p.

This is one of three published anthologies specifically devoted to the Berkeley student movement of 1964-65. It is the most comprehensive of the three, presents a wide variety of points of view and topics, and even includes several research studies. The selections are grouped under seven main headings: I. Students and Politics; II. Problems in the Multiversity--The Future Foreseen and Advocated; III. The History of a Student Revolt; IV. The Voice of the Actors (FSM and Other Student Groups, Administration, Faculty); V. Analyses and Interpretations (by Glazer, Goodman, Hook, Kerr, and others); VI. Berkeley Students under the Social Scientist's Eye; and VII. Documentary Appendices.

Section VI includes two research studies by Lyonns and Somers reporting data collected during the Berkeley demonstrations of 1964. Glen Lyonns ("The Police Car Demonstration: A Survey of Participants") administered a questionnaire to 618 participants and compared the demonstrators to the university population in general. He found, among other things, that 48 percent of the demonstrators had not previously participated in demonstrations, and 56 percent were willing to risk arrest and expulsion if negotiations broke down. The administration's handling of the affair was the reason most frequently given (63 percent) for joining the demonstration.

Robert H. Somers "The Mainsprings of the Rebellion: A Survey of Berkeley Students in November, 1964" conducted interviews with a carefully drawn sample of 285 students representing the whole student body. He found that 63% of his sample supported the goals, but not the tactics of the demonstrators; 34% supported both. Somers divides his November 1964 sample into militants (30%), moderates (30%), conservatives (22%), and unclassified (18%), and describes in detail their differences in background, beliefs, behavior and academic performance.

7. Mallery, David, Ferment on the Campus: An Encounter with the New College Generation. New York, Harper & Row, 1966. 147 p.

This book was sponsored by the College Personnel Institute of Claremont, California, to study students' awakening interests in political, social, and educational issues. The author in 1963 and 1964 observed and interviewed students in seven different institutions characterized by a variety of campus climates; he gives his impressions of the new ferment, describing it as a "new seriousness about the world and what an individual can do in it and for it." He describes the variety of ways and the intensity with which students at different institutions show an active concern about political and social issues and participate in service activities. He contrasts liberal student activists with students who have a conservative philosophy and with the anti-liberals, who have no coherent philosophy, but are threatened by the liberals. He also discusses the role of the faculty and administration in current campus upheavals, particularly in the light of the students' attempts to make personal contact with them. The author writes that the new ferment "includes many experiences and feelings and kinds of behavior. When the commentators 'account for' whatever is new on the campuses, they may be accounting for a rising concern for political realities or for explosions of lawless student agitation, for a new maturity of social vision or for an ugly rebelliousness." At the end, the author finds himself "far less eager to paint portraits and supply explanations than I might have been before."

8. Sampson, Edward E., ed., Journal of Social Issues. 1967

A forthcoming (1967) issue of The Journal of Social Issues will be devoted entirely to research reports and discussions of the activist movement. The following contributions, among others, are scheduled to appear: Christian Bay, "Political and Apolitical Students: Facts in Search of Theory"; Richard Flacks, "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest"; Kenneth Keniston, "The Sources of Student Dissent"; and Edward E. Sampson, "Student Activism and the Movement."

Bay, on the basis of a survey of empirical studies of political behavior and attitudes, attempts to detail how students who are active in protest movements tend to be different from apolitical students. He suggests that a major difference lies in their character structure; activists less frequently have "deeply repressed anxieties" about their own worth and they are less characterized by "milder ego deficiencies such as worry about popularity or career prospects."

Richard Flacks reports his research of activist students in the Middle West, describes the main themes of the activist movements, and offers hypotheses for the current emergence of activism. Among his findings: activists tend to come disproportionately from high-income, highly educated, and liberal families, and they have mothers who are disproportionately more frequently employed.

Kenneth Keniston differentiates the alienated student from the protester. "Alienated students are more likely to be disturbed psychologically and although they are often highly talented and artistically gifted, they are less committed to academic values and intellectual achievements than are protesters." He groups the sources of activism under four headings: (1) individual predisposition, (2) the educational setting, (3) the cultural climate, and (4) the historical situation. He argues that we may expect a continuation of protests because of young people's growing impatience with the humanitarian and aesthetic shortcomings of our society.

Edward Sampson describes a detailed network of conditions that must be considered in accounting for the emergence of activism. He groups his "activism-inducing contexts" under four headings: (1) family background, (2) personality, (3) institution, and (4) the national and international situation. A listing of the many factors he singles out under heading (3) has been given in the body of the text.

9. Williamson, E. G., and John L. Cowan, The American Student's Freedom of Expression: A Research Appraisal. Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota Press, 1966. 193 p.

This study is based on questionnaire responses obtained in 1964 from presidents, deans of students, chairmen of faculty committees on student affairs, student body presidents, and student newspaper editors of 849 institutions from all regions of the country and representing 10 categories of higher educational institutions (large and small public universities; technical institutions; teachers' colleges; and private nonsectarian, Protestant, and Catholic universities and colleges). Responses were analyzed under the following headings: freedom of discussion of controversial issues; freedom to invite speakers on controversial issues; freedom of organized protest action; freedom relating to civil rights issues; editorial freedom; and students' role in policy-making. The authors found many differences among institutions in permissiveness with regard to advocacy and action by student groups. Private universities and colleges and large public universities tended to be significantly more permissive than the remaining types of institutions. The different geographical regions showed few differences in regard to academic freedom.

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Barker, Edwin N., "Authoritarianism of the Political Right, Center, and Left." Journal of Social Issues, vol. 19, p. 63-74. 1963.

2. Bay, Christian, "Political and Apolitical Students: Facts in Search of Theory." Journal of Social Issues. 1967 (in press).

3. ____________, "Student Political Activism: Here to Stay?" Paper read at annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, 1967.

4. Berns, Robert F., "The Activist Student." Paper read at annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, 1967.

5. Block, Jeanne H., Norma Haan, and M. Brewster Smith. "Activism and Apathy in Contemporary Adolescents." In J. F. Adams, ed., Contributions to the Understanding of Adolescence. Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1967.

6. Blos, Peter, On Adolescence: A Psychoanalytic Interpretation, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1962.

7. Butz, Otto, ed., To Make a Difference--A Student Look at America: Its Values, Its Society, and Its Systems of Education. New York, Harper & Row, 1967.

8. Byrne, Jerome C., Report to the Forbes Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of California. May, 1965.

9. Cleaveland, Bradford, "A Letter to Undergraduates." Slate Supplement Report, September, 1964. Reprinted in Seymour Martin Lipset and S. S. Wolin, eds., The Berkeley Student Revolt, p. 66-81.

10. Coleman, J. S., The Adolescent Society: The Social Life of the Teenager and Its Impact on Education. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1961.

11. Conant, James Bryant, The American High School Today. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1959.

12. Dennis, Lawrence E., and Joseph F. Kauffman, The College and the Student: An Assessment of Relationships and Responsibilities in Undergraduate Education by Administrators, Faculty Members, and Public Officials. Washington, American Council on Education, 1966.

13. Draper, Hal, Berkeley: The New Student Revolt. New York, Grove Press, 1965.

14. Erikson, Erik H., Identity and the Life Cycle. New York, International Universities Press, 1959.

15. ________________, Youth: Change and Challenge. New York, Basic Books, 1963.

16. Fishman, Jacob R., and Frederic Solomon, "Youth and Social Action." Journal of Social Issues, vol. 20, No. 4, whole issue. October, 1964.

17. Flacks, Richard, "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest." Journal of Social Issues. 1967 (in press).

18. Freedman, Mervin B., "The Post-Industrial Generation: Roots of Student Discontent." The Nation, vol. 200, p. 639-43. June 14, 1965.

19. Freud, Anna, "Consultation with the Committee on College Students." New Haven, Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, 1963. Mimeographed.

20. Galbraith, John Kenneth, The Affluent Society. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1958.

21. Gelineau, V. A., and D. Kantor, "Pro-Social Commitment Among College Students." Journal of Social Issues, vol. 20, p. 112-30. 1964.

22. Goldsen, R. K., and others, What College Students Think. Princeton, Van Nostrand, 1960.

23. Goldstein, Richard, 1 in 7: Drugs on Campus. New York, Walker, 1966.

24. Goodman, Paul, Compulsory Mis-Education and The Community of Scholars. New York, Vintage Books, 1964.

25. Harrington, Michael, The Other America: Poverty in the United States. New York, Macmillan, 1962.

26. Heist, Paul, "Intellect and Commitment: The Faces of Discontent." Berkeley, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, 1965. Mimeographed.

27. Horowitz, David, Student: The Political Activities of the Berkeley Students. New York, Ballantine, 1962.

28. Jacobs, Paul, and Saul Landau, The New Radicals: A Report with Documents. New York, Random House, 1966.

29. Katope, Christopher G., and Paul G. Zolbrod, Beyond Berkeley: A Source Book in Student Values. Cleveland, World, 1966.

30. Katz, Joseph, "Personality Characteristics of Students Arrested During the Berkeley Sit-In of 1964." In Personality Development and the Impact of the College. (Forthcoming Report to the U. S. Office of Education and the Danforth Foundation, 1967).

31. ________________, and Nevitt Sanford, "Causes of the Student Revolution." Saturday Review, p. 64-67. December 18, 1965.

32. Keniston, Kenneth, "The Faces in the Lecture Room." In R. S. Morison, ed., The Contemporary University: U. S. A., p. 315-49. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

33. ________________, "The Sources of Student Dissent." Journal of Social Issues. 1967 (in press).

34. ________________, The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

35. Kerr, Clark, The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1963.

36. ________________, with G. B. Leonard and T. G. Harris. "The Turmoil in Higher Education." Look, p. 17-21. April 18, 1967.

37. Knorr, O. W., and W. J. Minter, eds., Order and Freedom on the Campus: The Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty and Students. Boulder, Colo., Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.

38. Kohn, Hans, "Youth Movements." In Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York, Macmillan, 1935.

39. Lipset, Seymour Martin, ed., "Student Politics." Comparative

Education Review, vol. 10, No. 2, p. 129-376. June, 1966.

40. Lipset, Seymour Martin. "Student Opposition in the United States." Government and Opposition, vol. 1, p. 351-74. 1966.

41. _______________, "University Students and Politics in Underdeveloped Countries." Comparative Education Review, vol. 10, p. 132-62. 1966.

42. _______________, and Philip G. Altbach, "Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States." Comparative Education Review, vol. 10, p. 320-49. 1966.

43. _______________, and S. S. Wolin, eds., The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations. Garden City, N. Y., Anchor, 1965.

44. Lunsford, Terry A., The Free Speech Crisis at Berkeley, 1964-1965: Some Issues for Social and Legal Research. Berkeley, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education and Center for the Study of Law and Society, 1965.

45. Lyonns, Glen, "The Police Car Demonstration: A Survey of Participants." In Seymour Martin Lipset and S. S. Wolin, eds., The Berkeley Student Revolt, p. 519-30.

46. Mallery, David, Ferment on the Campus: An Encounter with the New College Generation. New York, Harper & Row, 1966.

47. Michael, D. H., The Next Generation: The Prospects Ahead for the Youth of Today and Tomorrow. New York, Vintage, 1965.

48. Miller, Michael V. and Susan Gilmore, eds., Revolution at Berkeley. New York, Dell, 1965.

49. Morison, Robert S., ed., The Contemporary University: U.S.A. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

50. Muscatine, Charles, chairman, Education at Berkeley: Report of the Select Committee on Education. Berkeley, March, 1966.

51. Newfield, Jack, A Prophetic Minority. New York, New American Library, 1966.

52. Peterson, R. E., The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-1965. Princeton, Educational Testing Service, 1966.

53. Riesman, David, Paper read at Conference on Higher Education, Vassar College, 1957.

54. Rudolph, Frederick, The American College and University: A History. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

55. Sampson, Edward E., "Student Activism and the Movement." Journal of Social Issues. 1967 (in press).

56. Sanford, Nevitt, ed., The American College. New York, John Wiley, 1962.

57. ________________, "Leadership for Improving Conditions for Learning and Research." Paper presented at annual meeting of the Association for Higher Education, 1967.

58. ________________, Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1967.

59. Schiff, Lawrence F., "The Obedient Rebels: A Study of College Conversions to Conservatism." Journal of Social Issues, vol. 20, p. 74-95. 1964.

60. Simmons, J. L., and B. Winograd, It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today. Santa Barbara, Calif., Marc-Laird Publications, 1966.

61. Smith, M. B., "Explorations in Competence: A Study of Peace Corps Teachers in Ghana." American Psychologist, vol. 21, p. 555-66. 1966.

62. Solomon, F., and J. R. Fishman, "Youth and Peace: A Psychosocial Study of Student Peace Demonstrators in Washington, D. C." Journal of Social Issues, vol.20, p. 54-73. 1964.

63. Somers, Robert H., "The Mainsprings of the Rebellion: A Survey of Berkeley Students in November, 1964." In Seymour Martin Lipset and S. S. Wolin, eds., The Berkeley Student Revolt, p. 530-57.

64. Watts, William A., and David N. E. Whittaker, "Free Speech Advocates at Berkeley." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, vol. 2, p. 41-62. 1966.

65 . Westby, D., and R. Braungart, "Class and Politics in the Family Backgrounds of Student Political Activists." American Sociological Review, vol. 31, p. 690-92. 1966.

66. Williamson, E. G., and John L. Cowan, The American Student's Freedom of Expression. A Research Appraisal. Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press, 1966.

67. Wolin, Sheldon S., and John H. Schaar, "Berkeley and the University Revolution." New York Review of Books, p. 18-24. February 9, 1967.

REACTIONS

In order for this second series of "New Dimensions in Higher Education" to better serve the needs of colleges and universities throughout the nation, reader reaction is herewith being sought. In this instance, with respect to The Student Activists: Rights, Needs and Powers of Undergraduates, the following questions are asked:

1. Can you suggest other completed research, the results of which would add significantly to this report?
2. What problems related to this study should be given the highest priority, in terms of further research?
3. What suggestions do you have to help colleges and universities, or individual faculty members, in dealing constructively with the problems inherent in this movement?
4. What can the United States Office of Education do to help colleges and universities generally in dealing with this problem?

Kindly address reactions to:

Dr. Winslow R. Hatch
Bureau of Higher Education Research
Office of Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202